

REMARKS

Claims 60-79 are pending in the above-identified application. In the final Office Action dated March 21, 2007, the Examiner made the following disposition:

- A.) Rejected claims 60-79 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.
- B.) Rejected claims 60-79 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Richards* (U.S. 6,292,810) in view of *Horie, et al.* (U.S. 6,487,597) (“*Horie*”).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and address the Examiner’s disposition below.

- A.) Rejection of claims 60-79 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph:

Claims 60 and 70 have been amended as per the Examiner’s request to overcome the rejection.

Claims 61-69 and 71-79 depend directly or indirectly from claims 60 or 70 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 60 and 70 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

- B.) Rejection of claims 60-79 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Richards* (U.S. 6,292,810) in view of *Horie, et al.* (U.S. 6,487,597) (“*Horie*”):

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Independent claims 60 and 70 have been amended to clarify that there are a plurality of grid records. Each grid record stores a mapping between a plurality of spreadsheet file cells and the location of their corresponding cell data location information in a cell data record implemented in the record-based computer readable-medium.

Referring to Applicants’ Figure 3 as an illustrative example, claims 60 and 70, each as amended, each claim subject matter relating to determining whether cell data location information for a selected spreadsheet file cell is contained in a first grid record of a plurality of grid records. Each grid record stores a mapping between a plurality of spreadsheet file cells and the location of their corresponding cell data location information in a cell data record implemented in the record-based computer readable-medium. If the cell data location

information is contained in the first grid record, then the cell data location information is determined from the first grid record. The location of cell data corresponding to the spreadsheet file cell in the cell data record is determined based on the cell data location information. The cell data is extracted from the cell data record.

This is clearly unlike *Richards* in view of *Horie*, which fails to disclose or suggest determining whether cell data location information for a selected spreadsheet file cell is contained in a first grid record of a plurality of grid records, wherein each grid record stores a mapping between a plurality of spreadsheet file cells and the location of their corresponding cell data location information in a cell data record implemented in the record-based computer readable-medium. As acknowledged by the Examiner, *Richards* fails to disclose Applicants' claimed grid records. *Office Action of 3/21/07*, page 4.

Horie also fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed plurality of grid records. *Horie* teaches a system in which spreadsheet cells can be copied from a personal computer (PC) spreadsheet to a personal data assistant (PDA) spreadsheet. To do so, the spreadsheet cell data is copied from the PC spreadsheet to a clipboard and then pasted from the clipboard to the PDA spreadsheet. Unlike Applicants' claimed invention, nowhere does *Horie* disclose or suggest that a first grid record of a plurality of grid records is analyzed to determine whether the PC spreadsheet cell data location information is present in the first grid record. Instead, *Horie* merely teaches that data is copied to a clipboard. In fact, nowhere does *Horie* even discuss that there can be a plurality of grid records wherein each grid record stores a mapping between a plurality of spreadsheet file cells and the location of their corresponding cell data location information in a cell data record implemented in the record-based computer readable-medium. This subject matter is simply not addressed in *Horie*.

Therefore, *Richards* in view of *Horie* fails to disclose or suggest claims 60 and 70.

Claims 61-69 and 71-79 depend directly or indirectly from claims 60 or 70 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 60 and 70 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney to discuss the application.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Christopher P. Rauch/
Christopher P. Rauch
Registration No. 45,034

Customer No. 58328
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000